



H2020-Adhoc-2014-20-RTD-G.A. No. 699523 – JHEP2

Support to the implementation of the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) of the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI CH)

Instrument: Coordination and Support Action

Deliverable D2.1

Report of themes for joint calls and roadmap for future calls

Due date of deliverable: *31 December, 2016.*

Actual submission date: *19 December, 2016.*

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable: NWO (Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research)

Start date of project: 1st January 2016
Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities (Italy)
Project coordinator: Antonia Pasqua RECCHIA

Duration: 4 years

| Coordination and Support Action within Horizon 2020 (2014-2020) | | |
|---|---|----------|
| Dissemination Level | | |
| PU | Public | X |
| pp | Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services) | |
| RE | Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services) | |
| CO | Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services) | |



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 1. FROM SRA TOPICS TO 8 THEMES | 3 |
| 2. CANVAS OF RESEARCH PRIORITIES AND INTERESTS | 4 |
| 3. SURVEY ON TENTATIVE COMMITMENTS | 6 |
| CONCLUSION | 7 |
| ANNEX I – JHEP2 QUESTIONNAIRE | 9 |
| ANNEX II – SCOPE OF CALL: DIGITAL HERITAGE | 22 |
| ANNEX III – SCOPE OF CALL: CHANGING ENVIRONMENTS | 24 |
| ANNEX IV – SCOPE OF CALL: CONSERVATION & PROTECTION | 27 |
| ANNEX V – SCOPE OF CALL: IDENTITY & PERCEPTION | 29 |
| ANNEX VI – JHEP2 CALL TEXT FORMAT | 31 |

INTRODUCTION

In this report task leader NWO of task 2.1 will report on the identification of themes for joint calls and the development of a roadmap for future calls.

To support the development of new joint research calls task leader NWO and co-task leader AHRC clustered topics from the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) into a more focused list of 8 themes, listed on page 4 of this report, which was approved in the JHEP2 Steering Committee meeting on 3 December 2015 in Brussels.

To canvas the research priorities and the interest amongst the Partners for new joint calls, all Partners received a first questionnaire on 19 January 2016 (Annex I) in which they were asked to comment on and prioritize the 8 themes mentioned above. The results of the questionnaire and ensuing analysis, resulted in 4 promising themes for future calls: Changing Environments; Conservation & Protection; Digital Heritage; and, Identity & Perception. For all 4 a scoping exercise was carried out. The resulting 4 descriptions of these themes can be found in Annexes II through V. These themes and descriptions were discussed and agreed upon by the Partner organizations in the Steering Committee meeting of 7 June 2016 in Rome.

A second survey, on tentative commitments, was sent out on 27 June 2016. The Partners' responses on the second survey were analyzed and used as the groundwork for the suggestion of a Roadmap for calls for the period 2017-2019. This Roadmap was agreed at the JHEP2 Steering Committee meeting on 29 November 2016 in Rome and subsequently led to a decision to implement the Roadmap by the Governing Board on 30 November 2016 (Milestone 2) in Rome as well. The Roadmap is as follows:

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2017 | Digital Heritage |
| | Changing Environments |
| 2018 | Conservation & Protection |
| 2019 | Identity & Perception |

FROM SRA TOPICS TO 8 THEMES

In the SRA (delivered 2013) common Research Priorities have been identified: Developing a reflective society, Connecting people with heritage, Creating knowledge and Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource. Each research priority was divided into separate areas, such as Identity and perception, Values, Sustainability, Integrating risks, Conservation and so on. Underneath each of these areas potential research questions and goals have been listed.

In the pilot call (2012/2013) the following themes derived from the SRA were addressed:

1. Methods, tools (including non-invasive instruments) and modelling for understanding damage and decay mechanisms (including the effects of weathering and climate change) on tangible heritage (including buildings, sites and landscapes);
2. Materials, technologies and procedures for the conservation of tangible cultural heritage;

3. Use and re-use of buildings and landscapes, including the relationships between changes of use and public policy, including costs and added value (for example as a result of planning regulations and urban development);
4. Increasing understanding of cultural values, valuation, interpretation, ethics and identity around all forms of cultural heritage (tangible, intangible and digital heritage).

In HERITAGE+ (2014/2015) three topics were addressed:

1. Safeguarding tangible cultural heritage and its associated intangible expressions;
2. Sustainable strategies for protecting and managing cultural heritage;
3. Use and re-use of all kinds of cultural heritage.

In order to start the development of new and more focused joint research calls for the coming years, the questions of the SRA were clustered into a comprehensive list of 8 areas, keeping an eye on the goals formulated. The result was the following list of topics to be explored for new joint research calls:

1. Management and policy;
2. Technological improvements;
3. Conservation and protection;
4. Identity and perception;
5. Involvement;
6. Changing environments;
7. Digital heritage;
8. Overarching heritage questions.

We first noted that, taking into account the topics addressed by HERITAGE+ and the pilot call, the SRA-questions listed under Management and policy, Technological improvements and Conservation and protection have to a large extent been covered in previous calls.

Secondly we noted that the SRA-questions listed under Identity and perception, Involvement, Changing environments, Digital Heritage and Overarching questions have been covered to little extent or not at all. This observation means that for JHEP2 there are opportunities for at least 4 joint calls on these respective topics, but at the same time, there is scope for larger, integrated joint calls with a broader focus which might include the questions previously addressed by HERITAGE+.

We proposed joint calls could be developed and funded according to the idea of variable geometry: Partners commit themselves when interested. All Partners and other parties involved in the development of the new joint calls should be included in the decisions addressing the development of the Roadmap from an early stage on, in order to ensure clarity. This is why we proposed to start with a questionnaire to find out in which topics Partners are interested.

CANVAS OF RESEARCH PRIORITIES AND INTERESTS

To canvas the research priorities and the interest amongst the Partners for new joint calls, we sent out a questionnaire on 19 January 2016.

Section I of the questionnaire contained questions on the list of the aforementioned 8 themes. The second part of the questionnaire contained questions on the more detailed topics within these general themes.

The results of the questionnaire were sent to all partners on 22 March 2016. What stands out from the results of the questionnaire, is the following:

- All themes have attracted a certain amount of interest from the Partners, showing a wide divergence in ranking between Partners. However, Technological Improvements has been given the all-round lowest priority and Changing Environments the highest;
- Conservation & Protection has been prioritized the highest no less than 5 times, followed by Overarching Heritage Questions, which has been prioritized the highest 3 times;
- The top ranked themes are: Conservation & Protection (5 times 1, 1 time 2), Identity & Perception (2 times 1, 4 times 2), Changing Environments (1 time 1, 5 times 2) and Digital Heritage (2 times 1, 2 times 2);
- Two topics from Identity & Perception have been prioritized often, followed by one topic from Conservation & Protection, Involvement and Digital Heritage each.

Analysis of results and clustering process

The results of the questionnaire served as input for the next step: a clustering process, in order to arrive at 4 themes intended as starting points for call development.

- Trends in prioritization revealed we could divide the Partners into groups with similar choices in prioritized themes (Conservation & Protection, Identity & Perception, Changing Environments, Digital Heritage). This led to the conclusion these four themes could best serve as foundation for the next step in call development, and in doing so honoring the prioritization of all Partners;
- The topics of the aforementioned four themes were subsequently ranked according from highest to lowest priority;
- Several topics from the other four themes (Overarching Heritage Questions, Management & Policy, Involvement, Technological Development) that were prioritized by Partners logically connected to topics from the themes chosen.

Pooling these results of the questionnaire and subsequent analysis together, resulted in four thematic clusters:

- Changing Environments; with some additional topics from Overarching Heritage Questions;
- Conservation & Protection; Management & Policy; Technological Improvements;
- Digital Heritage; with some additional topics from Conservation & Protection, Identity & Perception, Involvement;
- Identity & Perception; Involvement; with some additional topics from Changing Environments, Overarching Heritage Questions;

The combinations of Partner priorities emerging from the questionnaire therefore resulted in four comprehensive, but manageable thematic clusters which contain most topics from the SRA.

Input was also received from JHEP2-members and –observers. Their input, combined with the Partners’ comments on the questionnaire, can function as additional information during the phase of call development.

The aforementioned four themes were presented to the Steering Committee meeting on 7 June 2016 in Rome, where the Partners agreed these themes should be the foundation to further explore the possibilities for future joint calls.

Scoping exercises

As a next step, NWO and AHRC enlisted the support of 8 experts, 4 from The Netherlands and 4 from The United Kingdom, to draft a first outline for the scope of future calls based of the above mentioned 4 themes. The expert couples were asked to reflect and appreciate the combined interests of the Partners, to include pioneering research visions and to be inclusive to a wide range of researchers from a variety of disciplines.

The expert couples are the following:

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <i>Changing Environments</i> | Dr Graham Fairclough Newcastle University | Professor Dr Jan Kolen Leiden University |
| <i>Conservation & Protection</i> | Professor Dr Heather Viles University of Oxford | Dr Maartje Stols-Witlox University of Amsterdam |
| <i>Digital Heritage</i> | Professor Dr Julian Richards University of York | Professor Dr Sonja de Leeuw Utrecht University |
| <i>Identity & Perception</i> | Dr Astrid Swenson Brunel University London | Professor Dr Inger Leemans VU University Amsterdam |

The resulting thematic scopes for future calls are to be found in Annexes II through V.

SURVEY ON TENTATIVE COMMITMENTS

On 27 June 2016 we sent out a request to use the described scopes of future calls for the four themes as a starting point for Partners to begin negotiations at the national level on financial commitment for one or more calls. The feedback we received presented us with a challenge, as most Partners had their tentative commitments accompanied by prerequisites, stipulations as well as differences in budget years. Not all Partners sent in a tentative commitment.

Based on the information gathered, an outline for a Roadmap yielded the following suggestion for call development over the period 2017-2019, as all alternative scenarios would result in calls with a (too) small amount of Partners:

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2017 | Digital Heritage |
| | Changing Environments |
| 2018 | Conservation & Protection |
| 2019 | Identity & Perception |

During the Steering Committee meeting on 29 November 2016 in Rome, the Partners came to an agreement on the suggested Roadmap. The Roadmap was subsequently presented for approval to the JPICH Governing Board on 30 November 2016, where it was favorably received. The GB decided to accept the Roadmap and have it implemented, which means we have successfully completed Milestone 2 ('At the end of the first year the GB will decide on a roadmap of future joint calls based on the SRA and in variable geometries of partners within JPI').

Steps to take

For 2017 the Roadmap contains two calls; these calls will be developed simultaneously by two different Handling Partners, although the call launch and other key dates of the calls may vary. NWO will be Handling Partner for the call on Digital Heritage.

Additionally Partners were asked to express their interest in participating in one or both of these calls to inform NWO before 15 December 2016.

It goes without saying the Roadmap is subject to changes after 2017. This provides us with the opportunity to update the Roadmap depending on the decision of the European Commission to include a COFUND-option in the work programme 2018-2019. It is important to note that two themes (Changing Environments and Conservation & Protection) fit into the Challenge 5 'Climate' work programme and the other two (Digital Heritage and Identity & Perception) in the Challenge 6 'Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies' work programme. Also: the COFUND-call can take place in 2019 at the earliest.

Practical joint call aspects

To support the development of joint calls, a standard Call Text Format was presented (Annex VI). Several basic principles of the JHEP2 Call development were agreed during the StC meeting on 29 November 2016; these are key eligibility requirements and therefore fundamental in the development of calls.

- 1 To be eligible to apply for funding, a Research project should comprise of at least three eligible research teams, each from a different country participating in the JHEP2 Call. The maximum number of research teams is five;
- 2 Partners participating in a JHEP2 Call commit themselves to funding only excellent Research projects as determined by the independent International Assessment Panel;
- 3 To guarantee a reasonable success rate for applicants (and fair use of any potential top-up funding provided by the EC), for each call it must be jointly agreed how many projects each Partner will fund from its national contribution. A range of 1 to 3 projects depending on the size of the Partner seems feasible;
- 4 For a joint call to be considered a JHEP2 call, at least five JHEP2 Partners should be participating. There is no maximum number;
- 5 For the first call a one stage selection process will be applicable.

CONCLUSION

As Milestone 2 was successfully reached, the Roadmap for future calls can be further implemented by developing four joint research calls based on the 4 agreed on themes:

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2017 | Digital Heritage |
| | Changing Environments |
| 2018 | Conservation & Protection |
| 2019 | Identity & Perception |

The first step in the development of the 2017 calls is setting up two Expert Groups. Partners committed to a call (Lead Partners) have been asked to nominate experts for these Expert Groups, to be established by NWO and AHRC before 31 December 2016, which will further develop the content of the calls based on the aforementioned thematic descriptions. Partner organizations with interest in call development but (yet) without option to commit were invited to become Observers to the call; having the opportunity to nominate an expert as well, which can inform the Partner about the call development while the Lead Partners' experts will have the decisive say in the process.

The Partners have also been asked to confirm their tentative commitments – making them preliminary final commitments – or present us with updated information. Partners have been asked to commit to either or both of the 2017 calls if they had not been able to do so before.

It is currently intended to launch the first call for JPI Cultural Heritage – Joint Heritage European Programme 2, in March 2017.



ANNEX I -

Questionnaire on joint research calls JHEP2

Introduction

Cultural heritage is a significant force for 21st century Europe. Not only is it at the heart of what it means to be European, it is being discovered by both governments and citizens as a means of improving economic performance, people's lives and living environments.

- Horizon 2020 Expert Group on Cultural Heritage, 2015

The ability to tackle the grand societal challenges and to respond rapidly to new challenges is dependent on a strong science base. This relies on research excellence and appropriate frameworks to foster interdisciplinary collaboration. Europe must maintain and raise the level of excellence to ensure world-class research and secure the long-term competitiveness of its science base.

- The Lund Declaration 2015

In line with the Lund Declaration 2015 and the report by the European Commission installed Expert Group in 2015, the primary focus of this questionnaire is to determine the research priorities amongst Partners as it is the intention to develop three joint focused calls and one joint COFUND call in the period 2017-2019, thereby supporting excellent research concerning cultural heritage.

In addition to determining the research priorities, the Partners' answers will function as the Partners' first tentative commitment. In order to develop a proper roadmap, which is as accurate as possible in this early phase, and being fully aware that the ultimate decision on financial commitment to joint calls can only be taken on the basis of a more detailed call text, it is important to note that the ranking of priorities emerging from the questionnaire will function as the groundwork for future call development. Answering the questionnaire is therefore not entirely noncommittal. We expect Partners to be genuinely interested in participating in new joint calls for the topics they prioritize highest, and will strive to get together the means necessary to engage, should these topics be chosen by the GB as focal points for new calls.

The prospective calls shall be developed and funded according to the idea of variable geometry; Partners can commit themselves to any call they are interested in and refrain from others. It is however the intention to have the broad joint COFUND call funded by all or most Partners.

The outcome of the questionnaire will be a thematic roadmap, ranking priorities, in a flexible way. As (focus on) societal challenges shift(s), the roadmap will be developed in such a way that it can be adapted over time to include emerging, new areas and topics relevant to cultural heritage research.

The questionnaire is made up of two sections, each asking Partners to prioritize. All questions from the

SRA were clustered into a comprehensive list of 8 areas presented during the EB- and GB-meetings in Paris on December 9-10, 2015. The emerging areas of the more forward looking Section 5 of the SRA (Empowerment, Co-creation, Importance of values, Valuing knowledge) have been included as well. The result is the following list (Section I of the questionnaire):

- Management and policy;
- Technological improvements;
- Conservation and protection;
- Identity and perception;
- Involvement;
- Changing environments;
- Digital heritage;
- Overarching heritage questions.

The second part of the questionnaire concerns the more detailed topics within these general areas.

Questionnaire on joint research calls JHEP2

Explanatory Note

The questionnaire is aimed at Programme Owners/Task Leaders representing the Partners. It is up to each Partner whether or not to consult NCPs in this phase in order to determine national cultural heritage research priorities. Based on the resulting ranking of area priorities, the area or areas most Partners are interested in for the development of the COFUND call will be identified. The prioritization of areas and topics combined will provide input for the development of the three prospective joint focused calls. It is the intention to process and share the first results in March and April of 2016 and to decide on the roadmap in the GB meeting at the end of 2016. From January 2017 the implementation phase will commence, starting with the drafting of the intended series of calls.

Structure of the questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of the following sections:

Identification

Section I: Priorities for areas

Section II: Priorities for topics within areas

The questions

Section I:

This section is made up of one question asking Partners to prioritize the 8 previously determined research areas according to their national research priorities or preferences. Please rank the areas from 1 to 8, with 1 being the highest priority and 8 being the lowest. In effect, ranking an area 1 says the area is of the utmost importance to the Partner and ranking an area 8 says the area is of little or no importance at all to the Partner.

Section II:

Subsequently, in this section Partners are asked to prioritize topics within the research areas. Partners are asked to select the top 15 topics they are interested in – these can be from any area and you can select more than one from an area. Partners are then asked to rank the 15 selected topics from 1 to 15, with 1 being the highest priority and 15 being the lowest.

Please note: these 15 topics can be selected from any of the areas. Partners are not obliged to select

topics from all areas, but can do so if they like. Effectively, this means topics can be selected from areas that are not given the highest priority under Section I.

Comments

After Section I and each area listed in Section II, a comment section is included. This comment section is intended for Partners to provide additional input. What kind of research topics/questions are missing from this area? Why were particular topics selected or areas selected, ranked and/or omitted? This information will assist in analyzing the accumulated information, in particular in case of very different responses.

Please use these comment sections extensively. According to the commentary provided, the roadmap and calls can be developed in much greater detail and potentially include currently relevant cultural heritage research priorities which may have arisen after the SRA was defined.

Questionnaire on joint research calls JHEP2

IDENTIFICATION

* Partner Information

Programme Owner

Partner Organization

Adress

Place

ZIP/Postcode

Country

E-mail Address

Telephone Number

Questionnaire on joint research calls JHEP2

SECTION I: Priorities for areas

-

*** Please rank the areas listed below from 1 to 8, with 1 being the highest priority.**

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Management & Policy |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Technological Improvements |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Conservation & Protection |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Identity & Perception |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Involvement |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Changing Environments |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Digital Heritage |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Overarching Heritage Questions |

Comments

| |
|----------------------|
| <input type="text"/> |
|----------------------|

Questionnaire on joint research calls JHEP2

SECTION II: Priorities for topics within areas

Please select 15 topics from all topics listed below. Please rank the selected topics, with 1 being the highest priority.

Management & Policy

1.1 The evidence required by decision makers when deciding new or changed uses for cultural heritage

1.2 The impact of context and histories on cultural heritage on how it is curated and managed

1.3 The embodied energy in heritage materials and energy systems in heritage structures and assemblies in order to develop effective, sustainable management plans

1.4 The management strategies to secure and protect cultural heritage in all its forms

1.5 The management of cultural heritage that respect the different values and beliefs people hold

1.6 Risk assessment methodologies, protocols and open source tools for efficient and responsible management of heritage

1.7 Co-creation: How can policy be designed in a way that genuinely uses the knowledge and capacity distributed in society?

Comments

Technological Improvements

2.1 The development of non-invasive, remote, imaging and non-destructive measurement and testing methods, techniques and instruments, for improved diagnostics, surveying and understanding of historical and technological contexts of art and heritage

2.2 The advancement of the use of reference collections of materials and data through better characterization, cataloguing and improved accessibility

2.3 The consequences of the changes in technology, questions over the ownership and responsibilities for heritage and who decides what happens to it

Comments

Conservation & Protection

3.1 The development of materials, technologies and procedures for long-term maintenance, secure access, conservation and in-situ preservation of cultural heritage which takes into account sustainability criteria

3.2 The development of sustainability strategies, including cultural, social, economic and environmental approaches

3.3 The approaches for protecting cultural landscapes, seascapes and heritage, and the safeguarding of their associated intangible expressions

3.4 The changes and their consequences for heritage objects, sites or landscapes, with special emphasis on getting insights into material decay by modelling and investigation of damage mechanisms

3.5 The opportunities heritage presents for revitalization and regeneration of artefacts, buildings and landscapes taking into account the values various kinds of cultural heritage hold

Comments

Identity & Perception

4.1 The contribution of the use of all forms of cultural heritage to existing identities and identity formation (at a personal, local, national, European, and/or global level)

4.2 The construction of narratives of cultural heritage

4.3 The understanding of values (including societal and economic) and meanings that are attributed to various kinds of cultural heritage and how are these understood by individuals and communities

4.4 The reasons we care about cultural value and heritage

Comments

Involvement

5.1 The forms of user interaction, involving interaction and dialogue with a range of heritage users

5.2 The ways for people to enhance their knowledge of all forms of cultural heritage and in doing so to connect to, and respect, their own and others' histories and identities

5.3 The ways these processes can be exploited to generate new knowledge around cultural heritage

5.4 The learning environments that can contribute to our understanding and coproduction of heritage

5.5 The ways in which people are both users and producers of cultural heritage

5.6 The challenge to make cultural heritage accessible to ensure the democratic right of everyone to share in its societal values

Comments

Changing Environments

6.1 The consequences for cultural heritage of demographic changes, such as changes due to conflict or rapid development, changes in the relation between the surrounding natural environment and societal development and the ways in which heritage is affected by these changes

6.2 The environmental assessment and monitoring technologies and systems, integrated with assessment of impact of agents of change on cultural heritage

6.3 The effects of climate change on all forms of cultural heritage, taking into account the values it holds for people and respecting its historic integrity

Comments

Digital Heritage (digitized and digital-born)

7.1 The understanding of quantitative and qualitative heritage databases along spatial, temporal or other scales, using data mining and similar techniques

7.2 The interaction between people and digital cultural heritage

7.3 The consequences of the changes in technology and changing rights, ownership and responsibilities around cultural heritage given the changing forms of access to heritage (digital) and new forms of heritage itself (digital-born)

Comments

Overarching Heritage Questions

8.1 The links between tangible, intangible and digital forms of heritage

8.2 The balance between historical integrity and authenticity to ensure that the interpretations of different publics are taken into account

8.3 The integration of the available cultural heritage information in different fields of study including, but not limited to, art history, science, digital heritage, conservation and maintenance, in order to move the field towards truly interdisciplinary heritage studies

8.4 Empowerment: How can cultural heritage research support empowerment and democratization within society (allowing access, enabling ownership)?

8.5 Importance of values: the intrinsic value of cultural heritage in society

8.6 Valuing knowledge: what new methods of evaluating cultural heritage research are needed?

Comments

ANNEX II – SCOPE OF CALL: DIGITAL HERITAGE

Brief overview of the area

Digital Heritage is an important emerging field of inter-disciplinary research in which a wide range of digital methods are applied to the creation, exploration, study, understanding, interpretation and presentation of tangible and intangible heritage, whether digitized or born-digital. It also includes the use of digital methodologies for the conservation and protection of heritage.

Challenges in the field

The field includes the support of online presentation, and the accessibility and use of cultural heritage, including both content and curation-related issues. Current challenges include the consequences of changes in technology and changing rights, ownership and responsibilities around cultural heritage given the changing forms of access to heritage (digital) and new forms of heritage itself (digital-born). We need to investigate the ways in which people interact with digital cultural heritage, the changing role of digital archives and memory institutions, and to examine the application of gaming and other interactive media in the heritage sector. Further challenges include the ways in which digital methods can be exploited to generate new knowledge and understanding around cultural heritage and the impact of digital methods on publication and other dissemination outputs in the heritage sector. At a policy level a significant challenge is the development of sustainability strategies for existing services, databases and practices.

Key approaches

Users and user perspectives need attention from both heritage institutions and academia. There is a need to engage users with the archive and to develop participatory approaches within archives. In order to increase the use of digital heritage and its impact, contextualisation and interpretation strategies need to be developed, without disregarding the constructed nature of data and metadata. Editorial mechanisms serving the needs of diverse user groups are just one way to make digital heritage understandable and meaningful. In line with this new ways of **digital storytelling** need to be developed in academia and within popular writing (online publications, transmedia storytelling, virtual exhibitions, podcasts etc.). Digital heritage has become a very rich source for **creativity**; professionals use and re-use digital heritage to develop new art projects, including documentaries and performances. At a large scale European citizens re-use and remix digital heritage material. With the help of innovative technologies use and re-use would become easier. One area that links presentation, access and use is that of **linked data**. Linking objects from different online cultural heritage databases, and datasets from outside the sector enables searching and finding relevant results based on concepts and content. Linked data thus supports networked research, which helps understand the (historical, cultural, social) connection between sources and how these informed European history and memory. Other key approaches include the exploitation of quantitative and qualitative heritage databases along spatial, temporal or other scales, using data mining and similar techniques, the development of mobile applications for improved heritage interaction and presentation, and the use of gaming technologies and interactive media, including acoustics, digital imaging and 3D methods, for heritage presentation. Digital approaches to protecting cultural landscapes, seascapes and heritage, and the safeguarding of their associated intangible expressions are also a key approach within this theme.



Potential outcomes and outputs

Outcomes might include new methods or the novel application of existing methods to the creation, study, understanding, interpretation, presentation, conservation and protection of tangible and/or intangible heritage. They might include traditional academic outputs and reports as well as new interactive media and games, online resources, performances and works of art. They should lead to the development of best practices for access policies and strategies, for online presentation (for public and academic audiences) and for curation. The domain lends itself to external partnership working with arts, cultural and heritage agencies, and projects might be expected to demonstrate social and/or economic impact.

ANNEX III – SCOPE OF CALL: CHANGING ENVIRONMENTS

Brief overview of the area

This potential call supports heritage-based research into ongoing processes of change in the environment and societal responses to it.

‘Environment’ is defined here not only in physical terms but also through its virtual and digital expressions. It is also interpreted as *necessarily* including the role of human society, highlighting the contributions that heritage makes to identity and perception. Fundamental to all projects under this call will be recognition of the full range of the values and meanings that heritage holds for people individually and as part of communities. Research funded under this call will be heritage-centred but must reach out in a significant degree to disciplines and practice beyond heritage fields, notably in the environmental, social and information sciences, as well as in design disciplines such as landscape architecture and urban planning).

‘Environmental change’ is taken to include (but not be restricted to) demographic changes (notably urbanisation, population mobility and migration); armed conflict and instability due to politics and poverty; rapid economic development and globalising tendencies; climate change and changes in the environment such as desertification or rewilding; the provision of (eg) food, water and energy security; societal development and sustainability actions; and the security and safety of the ‘archive of human history and development’ (heritage fabric, archives, digital data).

The call will support research that explores *both* the impact of changing environments on cultural heritage of all types and value (i.e. the sustainability challenge of sustaining heritage resources) *and* the ways in which heritage practices and understanding as well as cultural heritage itself can be effective with regards to economic, social and environmental issues (i.e. helping society to address environmental change).

Particular concerns of the call are to encourage:

- integration of information and ideas from different fields of cultural heritage study (including but not limited to art history, archaeology, conservation science, digital heritage, landscape and site management),
- the forging of stronger links between tangible, intangible and digital forms of heritage,
- improved methods of landscape characterisation, environmental assessment and monitoring, the evaluation of cultural heritage research, its results and its practical applications,
- the integration of heritage research into genuinely interdisciplinary approaches, collaborating with perspectives and knowledge from other cultural, environmental, societal and landscape focused disciplines (including but not limited to ecology, economy, geography, landscape architecture and urban planning, political science and the social sciences),
- pioneering research (quantitative and qualitative) into the accelerated pace of environmental change, whether natural/climatic or humanly-induced, and its (possible) long as well as short term effects on cultural heritage, heritage practices and the social memories of communities,
- understanding of drivers and agents of change which affect heritage in the wider environment and people’s relationship to it, including ‘passive’ changes as well as ‘active’ (eg population decline as well as increase, neglect as well as development).

Challenges in the field

- Insufficient integration and collaboration within the heritage sphere, and between it and other disciplines and fields of research, such as urban design, ecology, tourism and leisure studies, information science, etc.
- Limited public involvement and participation in official heritage decisions, partly because 'public heritage' is often 'non-canonical' (i.e. every day, recent, painful or personal heritages) and memory-based
- How changes in the environment due (reciprocally) to migration and mobility are mediated through engagement with cultural heritage, landscape and identity, and histories and memories transmitted through place and space.
- Limited understanding of how identity and significance adapt to both environmental change and to the changing demographic composition of society and communities
- The restricted extent to which heritage, heritage knowledge and heritage ideas influence mainstream policy making and action, thus not fulfilling their potential positive contribution to the societal responses to changing environments
- The division between 'conventional' heritage and intangible and digital heritage
- Changing attitudes and shifting balances between public/private in governance, competing concepts of 'ownership'
- How to capitalise on emerging heritage paradigms and debates - 'preservation' versus 'management of change', heritage rights versus responsibilities, changing notions of authenticity and authentication, critical or local approaches versus 'authorised' or 'universal' heritage discourses

Key approaches

Responses to this call must move the field towards truly interdisciplinary studies within and beyond heritage, and they will score most highly if they use several of the following approaches:

- Recognition of 'non-canonical' heritage (such as heritage that is painful, contested, politically-charged, mundane / ordinary, unorthodox or disapproved of)
- Recognition of the digital dimension of present day environments and heritage (e.g. analytical approaches to "big data" (such as 3D modelling) and heritage represented within social media
- A landscape-framed approach: developing or rediscovering 'landscape' as an integrative concept for heritage, land use, nature, urban development, etc.
- The giving of equal weight to both intangible and tangible heritage
- Identity-based as well as (or instead of) values-based approaches
- Methods for the creation/adaptation/modification of heritage that are rooted in design, storytelling and narrative, especially in the context of emerging heritage paradigms
- International collaboration beyond Europe - global challenges need a dialectic between local and global research



Potential outcomes and outputs

- Greater mainstreaming of heritage contributions and concerns
- Strengthened collaborations with other major fields of research into changing environments
- More detailed understanding of the impacts of changing environments on heritage
- Improved understanding of the potential roles of heritage in societal response to changing environments, and in effecting social change and in improving the quality of life.
- Strengthened understanding of how individual and collective identities are influenced by heritage and change as a way of responding to changing environments
- Increased public understanding and involvement in new heritage approaches.

ANNEX IV – SCOPE OF CALL: CONSERVATION & PROTECTION

Brief overview of the area

Protecting, conserving and enjoying our cultural heritage in a changing world

Safeguarding Europe's unique cultural heritage against continuous decay under global change conditions is a major concern for decision makers and researchers in Europe. Cultural heritage includes tangible (movable and immovable) and intangible assets, and encompasses a huge range of types including those which overlap with natural heritage, such as cultural land- and seascapes. Both natural (climate, weathering, etc.) and anthropic factors (lack of recognition, war, neglect, visitor numbers, etc.) pose major threats to the remnants of Europe's past, one of the most diverse and rich patrimonies in the world.

Public interest in Europe's cultural heritage is high. According to a Eurobarometer survey, 52% of EU citizens in 2013 visited at least one historical monument or site and 37% a museum or gallery in their home countries, and 19% visited a historical monument or site in another EU country. The importance that European citizens attach to cultural heritage, demonstrates the societal value of improving the resilience of Europe's cultural heritage against decay. Heritage supports social cohesion, regeneration, cultural and economic growth.

Research into strategies, methodologies and tools to conserve and protect the physical components of our cultural heritage is crucial for the development of a global approach for preserving Europe's remnants of the past and towards making them a key factor for a better understanding our history, traditions and culture, of our individual and collective identities, and ultimately of our well-being.

Challenges in the field

- Developing effective and sustainable approaches to protect, manage, regenerate, revitalize and allow secure access to Europe's cultural heritage
- Safeguarding the intangible expressions of cultural heritage, including management strategies that take into account the impact of context and histories, as well as the embedded energy in heritage materials, structures and assemblies
- Finding novel methods to include cultural, social, economic and environmental values in heritage management
- Informing and engaging the general public and raising their awareness of issues related to conservation and protection of cultural heritage
- Developing management strategies involving local communities, and/or co-creation policies that use the knowledge and capacity distributed in society
- Resolving questions of ownership, responsibilities for heritage and who decides what happens to it
- Developing risk assessment methodologies, protocols and open source tools for heritage management
- Developing and advancing the use of modelling and other non-invasive, remote, imaging and non-destructive measurement and testing methods, techniques and instruments, for improved diagnostics, surveying and understanding of historical and technological contexts of art and heritage and for the evaluation of the effects of conservation & protection measures
- Developing sustainable materials, technologies and procedures for conservation and maintenance as well as for in-situ preservation of cultural heritage

- Optimizing the use, applicability and value of earlier research results, such as reference collections of scientific and material data, in the field of cultural heritage through shared network building, characterization and cataloguing

Key approaches

Interdisciplinarity - involving science, engineering, technology, conservation and culture - is key to preventing potentially conflicting approaches to conservation and protection by different parties involved (research/ administration/ management/ conservation/ exploitation). Both the changing nature of heritage (recently added are, for example, new media, digital heritage) and methods available to us for safeguarding heritage require us to update our approach to cultural heritage. By taking into account new ways of communication enabled by technological advances it becomes possible to engage new, larger and diverse audiences, thus improving the societal value and impact of Europe's cultural heritage as a way to improve inclusiveness and understanding in society. The area of conservation & protection is well suited to interdisciplinary cooperation between the humanities, social sciences and hard sciences. External partnerships with the arts, cultural and heritage agencies and with industry (e.g. instrumental and software development) will connect the academic world with society at large. Importantly, sustainability in conservation and protection is possible only when local communities are actively involved, becoming co-owners of the projects developed.

Potential outcomes and outputs

Output in the area of conservation & restoration includes new methods or the novel application of existing methods for the understanding, interpretation, conservation, protection and presentation of tangible and/or intangible heritage. Besides traditional academic output and reports, output will include novel, preferably non-invasive investigative methods, platforms for sharing information online (databases, reference collections), guidelines for the protection/conservation of heritage and tools/interfaces to engage with the public.

ANNEX V – SCOPE OF CALL: IDENTITY & PERCEPTION

Brief overview of the area

In the rapidly expanding field of ‘heritage studies’, questions about identity have long been central. Many of the foundational works from the 1980s (be it as part of the English ‘heritage debate’ or the French turn toward *lieux de memoire*), which continue shaping the field, suggested strong links between heritage and identity. While disagreeing over whether heritage was a negative force that prevented dealing with the challenges of the present by creating a nostalgic longing for the past, or a positive force that provided a sense of belonging and empowerment for those that ‘history had forgotten’ - almost all assumed that a central function of heritage was the creation of national identity. In turn interest in heritage was often taken as indicator for identification with the nation. While these ideas are still prevalent both in research and policy, a number of approaches have broadened the focus and nuanced assumptions. Changes came from grassroots movements re-vindicating the inclusion of hitherto neglected heritage and the participation of marginalized communities, from the turn towards diversity and intangibility within international organizations, and from a range of academic disciplines. Postcolonial criticism has shifted attention to race, and its relation to gender and class; the transnational turn has drawn greater attention to the relationship between local, national and transcultural processes and identities; the increasing focus which economist put on happiness and wellbeing has revived a largely forgotten Victorian ideas about the benefits of heritage for physical and mental health; the growth of sensory studies across the humanities, social sciences and brain sciences has opened up reflection on the nature of perception and the relation between sensation, perception and identity. Meanwhile, and relatedly, approaches to musealisation and interpretation have changed in directions more attune to cultural diversity and more emphatic on the co-creation of heritage and heritage interpretation with the public. However, while the right to heritage has been recognized internationally, access to heritage participation remains unequal. Moreover, while interdisciplinary, international and inter-community approaches have grown rapidly, these approaches are still often marginal in a field dominated by institutional and national frames.

Challenges in the field

The most important challenges seems to be how cultural heritage research can support equality, empowerment and democratisation, while also help to foster wellbeing and sustainability, i.e. how the knowledge and enjoyment of heritage can play a part in addressing the biggest global challenges. The questions posed by the questionnaire capture the challenges and open questions well. Their fundamental rather than country specific nature seem best suited to produce interesting results. From both national and international perspective, these fundamental questions address the most pressing global concern and are open enough to help revealing and addressing specific local and national challenges

Above everything else, a better theoretical and empirical understanding of the relation between heritage, perception and identity is necessary. The next step is to develop policy approaches and modes of engagement that are viable also under increasing pressure on resources and in political climates in which ‘identities’ and ‘heritages’ are being increasingly mobilized for divisive ends. For this it might not be a bad starting point to question the often assumed intrinsic link between heritage and identity. We still know surprisingly little about how ‘heritage’ is perceived and how this perception is shaped by, and does or does not lead to, particular identities. Despite the growth of

work that problematizes the complexity and intersectionality of identities this area is relatively underdeveloped in heritage studies. We also need to know more about general heritage principals versus cultural context, through historical and contemporary comparisons. And we need to reexamine how dialogue can be established, as too often there is an underlying belief that exchange will automatically lead to understanding, yet there is not enough research on when and why works – or not. To provide an understanding of the role ‘heritage’ currently plays, or should play, it is also worth asking whether the label heritage is necessarily the most helpful, how different approaches need to be adopted for the multitude of ‘things’ denoted by the term ‘heritage’, and how the term should be complemented or exchanged.

Key approaches

Expertise across the arts, humanities, social sciences and natural sciences and interdisciplinary exchange between them are needed. More fundamental research is needed on how perception, identity, attachment and belonging are created sensorially and discursively. Diachronic and synchronic studies on the creation, perception, affect and effect of heritage are necessary. To understand cultural contingency, longitudinal perspectives (including those that take into account periods before the use of the present term ‘heritage’) are as important as comparative, transnational and transcultural work. Studies need to not only pay attention to how heritage can connect communities, but also to where and why it is divisive and how this can be overcome. In this connection, more education, communication and debate about the processes that create ‘heritages’ and ‘identities’ seems desirable to de-essentialise both and to open a productive dialogue over contested heritages and warring identities. In the framework of a joint call, it seems particularly useful to sharpen the conceptual frame through exchange on methods and concepts in each language and culture, to learn from successful examples in each country and debate how they could be adapted, to outline whether challenges are similar or culturally specific and to develop tools for highlighting transcultural processes and enhancing transcultural communication.

Connections with other agenda’s such as digital heritage development can obviously strengthen this theme. Digital infrastructures support and structure the representation and interrelation of cultural heritage and help construct different *narratives of cultural heritage*.

Potential outcomes and outputs

Outcomes could include classic academic outputs, conferences, workshops, knowledge transfer activities and policy recommendation and educational resources that establish the state of the art on the questions raised by the questionnaires and above, address gaps and develop perspective for development. These should be not only complemented, but be informed by co-curated projects (from debates to exhibitions, performances, publications, films, websites, broadcasts etc) that discuss and debate how people are both users and producers of cultural heritage, showing the multiplicity of meaning given to heritage as object and idea. To use heritage as a tool for democratization and empowerment, accessibility needs be systematically widened – but access to heritage as objects needs to be thought of alongside access to the discourses about heritage. Education seems a central route for these goals.

ANNEX VI – JHEP2 CALL TEXT FORMAT



JPI Cultural Heritage and Global Change Joint Heritage Programme 2 Call

Deadline for submission of full proposals: **[DATE]**.

In developing the Full Proposals, applicants must follow the guidelines and the application structure as explained below and continue to ensure a strong fit to the aims and research topics of the Joint Heritage Programme 2 (JHEP2) Call.

1. Introduction

This JHEP2 Call is designed to support the development of new, research-based knowledge on cultural heritage and so to meet societal challenges and contribute to the development of society. The call aims to fund excellent collaborative, transnational, interdisciplinary, innovative research projects focused mainly on [THEME].

The aims of the call are:

- to support well-defined, interdisciplinary and collaborative Research projects of the highest quality and standards that will lead to significant advances in our understanding of cultural heritage across the broader research community and in society;
- to maximise the value of research outcomes by promoting their transfer to individuals and organisations outside the immediate research community, to include, policy makers, businesses and commercial enterprises, the broader heritage sector, voluntary and community groups and the general public;
- to support a range of interactions and partnerships between cultural heritage researchers and a variety of user communities, to include, policy makers, businesses and commercial enterprises, the broader heritage sector, voluntary and community groups and the general public.

A. Research Topics

The research topics on which the JHEP2 Call is focused on have been drawn from areas identified in the Strategic Research Agenda for the Joint Programming Initiative in Cultural Heritage and Global Change (www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/2014/02/strategic-research-agenda-sra/). The focus of the current call has been collectively determined by the Partner organisations supporting this call.

While applicants will be asked to identify a main topic which will be addressed by their project, they are not formally required to work on a single topic. It is therefore acceptable for a project to address issues from more than one of the JHEP2 Call topics to help address the broader challenges affecting cultural heritage.

Cultural heritage is a complex area requiring an interdisciplinary approach. Proposals will be expected to integrate existing and available knowledge in different fields of study from as many disciplines as possible in order to move the field towards truly interdisciplinary heritage studies. It is hoped that applicants will encourage the inclusion of researchers in their projects from these areas and from other disciplines not previously associated with research on cultural heritage.

The topics are set out below with indicative statements and questions – these are intended to explain the topics and stimulate proposals, not to prescribe or specify the projects to be funded.

The topics are [TO BE DEVELOPED BY THE EXPERT GROUPS COMPRISING EXPERTS NOMINATED BY THE COMMITTED PARTNERS]:

1. **[TOPIC]**
This topic could include, for example, research into:
2. **[TOPIC]**
This topic could include, for example, research into:
3. **[TOPIC]**
This topic could include, for example, research into:

2. Eligibility

For this call each individual country's eligibility rules apply for the teams located in that country. Prior to submitting the full proposal, applicants should check the eligibility criteria for each country, which can be found in **Annex A** along with contact details for Partner organisations in each country – some points in Annex A have been clarified so please ensure you read and take them into account.

To be eligible, full proposals must be:

- **Submitted via the JPI Cultural Heritage website before the submission deadline;**
- **Eligible, with respect to the relevant National Eligibility Criteria;**
- **Complete and in the prescribed format.**

Please note that if significant changes have been made to any of the research teams or the project without prior approval from the relevant Partner organisation for your country, the whole project could be deemed ineligible and withdrawn. Applicants are not expected to make any changes to the total budget, although slight changes between eligible items are permitted.

Eligibility of Applicants

In these guidelines, the term 'researcher' refers to anyone involved in gathering of data, information and facts for the advancement of knowledge, or development of tools and methodologies providing they are eligible according to their country's National Eligibility Criteria. These can include, for example, those from academia, institutions carrying out research, institutions responsible for the management and protection of cultural heritage, industry and/or SMEs.

- Only researchers located in the countries participating in the JHEP2 Call are eligible to apply, irrespective of their nationality. These are: [COUNTRY NAMES];
- Each project consortium must comprise of at least **three** research teams, each from a different country participating in the JHEP2 Call and based in an eligible institution. The maximum number of research teams in a project is **five**;
- Each participating researcher must be based at an eligible institution and be considered eligible for funding by the Partner organisation(s) of the country where s/he is located. **Please make sure you adhere to the National Eligibility Criteria for the country you reside in (Annex A)**;
- The project consortium must demonstrate sufficient research capacity in order to achieve the project objectives and the management of the consortium must be outlined and explained.

Project Structure and roles of Project Partners

- Each project must comprise of **at least three eligible Principal Investigators (PI)**, each based in an eligible institution in a different country participating in the JHEP2 Call. The application must identify one of the Principal Investigators as the **Project Leader**;
- **The Project Leader (PL)** is responsible for carrying out and managing the project, in addition to her/his project related research. The PL is a senior researcher with a solid experience of managing collaborative research projects. S/he will be the contact person for the JHEP2 Handling Partner throughout the application process and is responsible for communication with the other partners in the project. Finally, the PL is responsible for the intellectual agenda and coherence of the project as well any reporting duties;
- **A Principal Investigator (PI)** is responsible for leading research activities at her/his institution. The PI is also responsible for the administrative and financial management of funds (if successful) that will be transferred to her/his host institution. Other researchers (senior researchers, post-doctoral researchers) can be part of the PI project **team** – please read the National Eligibility Criteria for each country (**Annex A**). There can be more than one PI per country but only one PI per institution per project.

Associate Partners (AP)

- The following participants in a JHEP2 project should be referred to as **Associate Partners** in the full proposal – **these are any participants in a JHEP2 project that would not usually be eligible according to the National Eligibility Criteria for their country (see Annex A)**. They cannot have an integral role in the project and no other information has to be submitted about them (for example: CVs);
- The inclusion of other **stakeholders** is strongly encouraged in JHEP2 Call as they can often provide significant added value and valuable insights to the project. They can contribute to a project in an advisory and collaborative capacity to help explore the knowledge transfer/exchange potential and impact of the proposed research;
- In addition, **researchers from non-JHEP2** participating countries can be included in, for example, advisory groups, workshops and so on, and their role can be described in the Description of Work.

The contribution of APs to the project will need to be outlined within the application and a letter of support from the AP must be included.

Eligible Costs

- All costs must be eligible according to the National Eligibility Criteria for each country involved in the project;
- For each project, project teams based in each country can request costs up to the available relevant national project funding budget limit given in **Annex A**;
- A detailed budget description is required, in particular the total cost of the project per team and the requested funding per team. You are also required to explain the source of any additional funding;
- Eligible costs will generally include direct costs such as employment costs, equipment, travel and meeting costs, consumables, dissemination and knowledge transfer costs. Countries differ in the criteria for eligible costs so please read the National Eligibility Criteria in **Annex A** to verify the eligibility of specific budget items according to the rules of the countries participating in your project;
- Countries differ in the available support for non-academic/government/industry partners – please check the National Eligibility Criteria for each country in **Annex A**;
- The estimated budget must be provided in the budget template and in Euros only. Both the total budget, the requested JHEP2 funding and additional funding must be specified;
- Recipients of JHEP2 funding are strongly encouraged to use Open Access publishing wherever possible (see section 5. Open Access Publishing). If publishing under ‘author pays’ regimes is foreseen during the application phase, the related costs should be included in the budget. Costs must be plausible, justified/substantiated and eligible according to the National Eligibility Criteria;
- Projects must not exceed **[NUMBER] months** in duration. Projects must start from **[DATE]** and finish by **[DATE]** at the latest.

3. Application Procedures

All proposals must be submitted electronically via the JPI Cultural Heritage website. The deadline for submission is **[TIME]** CET on **[DATE]**. Late applications will not be accepted.

1. **All proposals must be submitted in English;**
2. **The proposal must be submitted by the Project Leader;**
3. **The proposal must consist of one .pdf and one Excel file. These should be submitted as a single, compressed folder (.rar or .zip) which should not exceed 10MB in size.**

Proposal Structure

All proposals should be structured following the guidelines below. All page lengths are inclusive of all text, tables (excluding budget table), references, diagrams, and pictures.

The proposal application consists of two files:

1. The application form, including summary, the Description of Work and associated information (.pdf only).
2. Actual (total) and requested budget per partner (Excel workbook only), and additional funding if applicable (Excel file).

All filenames should follow the prescribed format below. No other files are permitted. Guidelines for completing the two files is provided below.

The application form for full proposals can be accessed via the JPI Cultural Heritage website. The whole application should be submitted as one single, compressed folder (.rar or .zip) that includes one .pdf file and one Excel file, should not exceed 10MB in size and should not be password protected.

To submit your full proposal via the JPI Cultural Heritage website, you should follow the instructions below:

[TO BE FILLED IN BY HANDLING PARTNER INSTRUCTIONS]

Applicants will be allowed to upload and replace the documents from [DATE] at [TIME] CET until [DATE] at [TIME] CET.

A. Application form (.pdf)

The form will ask for:

- basic details such as the names and institutions of the applicants, contact details, the project title and relevance to JHEP2 research topics;
- a summary of the project (Section A);
- the full Description of Work (Section B).

Project Summary (Section A)

The abstract in the summary should be written in English, be no more than 300 words and provide:

- a brief context for the proposed research;
- the aims and objectives of the project;
- the relevance to the JHEP2 aims and research topics;
- expected outcomes/impacts of the JHEP2 project;
- A maximum of **five** free-text keywords.

The Description of Work and associated information (Section B)

All pages in this section must be numbered. **An application without a Description of Work will not be accepted.** The Description of Work should be a self-contained description of the proposed research. **It should be written in English and should not exceed the page limits provided below (all page limits are inclusive of all text, tables (excluding the budget tables), references, diagrams and pictures).** The minimum font size allowed is 11 (Arial or Times New Roman only). All margins should be at least 15 mm (not including footers or headers).

The Description of Work should be structured as follows:

Part A – Description of Research (suggested 10 pages max.)

A1 Concept, and research questions and objectives of the JHEP2 project.

A2 Research context.

A3 Research design and methodology, including interdisciplinary approach.

A4 Work plan, detailed timeline and milestones.

A5 Short bibliography supporting the research case.

Part B – Description of Implementation and management (suggested 5 pages max.)

B1 Description of the JHEP2 project management structure and procedures.

B2 Description of the quality, and relevant expertise and experience of the individual participants (including experience of coordinating research across national boundaries).

B3 Description of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance between disciplines, level of staffing, plans for effective collaboration), including other stakeholders.

B4 Allocation and justification of the resources to be committed **(please copy in all Excel tables according to the Section 2)** along with a justification of the distribution of costs across the PIs and of the overall requested budget.

Part C – Potential Impact (suggested 5 pages max.)

C1 Relevance to the JHEP2 Call for Proposals including fit to the aims and research.

C2 Contribution of ideas and knowledge that can be transferred to public and private stakeholders.

C3 Expected relevance of the project outcomes and its potential value for researchers, non-academic stakeholders and society, including SMEs, heritage owners, public administrations, research partners and local communities. Description of the involvement and contributions of APs (if applicable).

C4 Planned activities and measures to maximise knowledge exchange and transfer, and the dissemination and/or exploitation of transnational JHEP2 project results, and management of copyright, intellectual property, ethical issues* and research integrity**.

Part D – CVs

Please include CVs for the Project Leader and all Principle Investigators (max one page of A4 each).

Part E – Letters of Commitment

If applicable, letters of commitment from each of the Associate Partners – max one side of A4 each, in English). If APs are involved, an electronic copy of the signed and stamped letter of commitment **must** be included. The letter should explain the APs interest and role in the JHEP2 project and make explicit the nature of the APs commitment to the JHEP2 activities (financially and/or in kind).

* Research teams are responsible for ensuring that ethical issues relating to the research project are identified and brought to the attention of the relevant approval or regulatory body in their respective countries. Ethical issues should be interpreted broadly and may encompass, among other things, relevant codes of practice, the involvement of human participants, tissue or data in research, the use of animals, research that may result in damage to the environment and the use of sensitive economic, social or personal data.

** Research Integrity: When preparing your proposal and carrying out your research project applicants are expected to adhere to rules of good research practice as outlined in The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (<http://www.esf.org/activities/mo-fora/research-integrity.html>). The principles of integrity include, among others, fairness in providing references, giving credit, honesty in communication and impartiality and independence.

B. Budget tables (.xls or .xlsx)

Please provide details of the budget for the JHEP2 project using the full proposal budget template provided at the JPI Cultural Heritage website. This information should be shown in one file and any additional information, other than requested and provided on other worksheets will not be taken into account.

You should include:

- The summary budget (overall, requested and additional funding) for the JHEP2 project for the whole duration of the project (**Budget Table A**);
- The detailed total and requested budget for each PI per year (**Budget Table B**).

C. Call Timetable

| Procedure | Schedule |
|---|-----------------------|
| Launch of the JHEP2 Call | [DATE] |
| Deadline for submission of proposals | [DATE], [TIME] |
| Eligibility check (including National Eligibility check) | From [DATE] to [DATE] |
| Evaluation of proposals by independent international peer reviewers | From [DATE] to [DATE] |
| Independent International Assessment Panel meeting | [DATE] |
| Funding decisions | [DATE] - [DATE] |
| Start of research projects | From [DATE] |
| End of research projects | [DATE] |

4. Assessment procedures and criteria

The assessment of full proposals

All aspects of the full proposals will be assessed against **all** the assessment criteria and applicants should ensure that the information in the Description of Work addresses all the requirements under each of the criteria.

The assessment of full proposals will be undertaken by independent international peer reviewers covering all fields of research relevant to the research topics. After the independent experts have carried out a remote evaluation of the full proposal, an independent International Assessment Panel will meet to discuss and agree upon a final score for each proposal, which will determine a ranking list. The JPI Cultural Heritage Governing Board will ensure and verify the fair and equitable nature of the evaluation process and its compliance with the JHEP2 and JPI guidelines.

Eligible **proposals** will be assessed against the following, European Commission supported, evaluation criteria:

| Criterion | Threshold/Score |
|---|-----------------|
| Research excellence – the quality of the transnational project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound concept, and quality of research questions and objectives • Progress beyond the state-of-the-art • Quality and effectiveness of the research, methodology and interdisciplinary approach, and associated work plan | 3/5 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| Potential impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit to the aims and topics of JHEP2 • Contribution of ideas and knowledge that can be transferred to public and private stakeholders • Likelihood that the outputs and outcomes will be highly valued and used by researchers, non-academic stakeholders and society, including SMEs, heritage owners, public administrations, research partners and local communities. • Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of JHEP2 project results, and management of intellectual property. | 3/5 |
| Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality, and relevant expertise and experience of the individual participants (including experience of coordinating research across national boundaries) • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance between disciplines, level of staffing, plans for effective collaboration), including other stakeholders • Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be | 3/5 |

5. Open Access Publishing, Dissemination and Knowledge Transfer/Exchange

Open Access Publishing

Recipients of a JHEP2 grant are required to deposit an electronic copy of each of the published version(s) or final manuscript(s) accepted for publication of a research publication relating to project results published before or after the JHEP2 grant final report in an institutional or subject-based repository at the moment of publication. JHEP2 grant recipients are required to make their best efforts to ensure that electronic copies become freely and electronically available to anyone through this repository:

1. either immediately if a research publication is published 'open access', i.e. if an electronic version is also available free of charge via the publisher;
2. or within six months of publication.

Each publication must also be uploaded to the Heritage Portal at www.heritageportal.eu/.

Dissemination and Knowledge transfer/Exchange

Knowledge transfer and exchange activities are a crucial dimension to any proposed research project. In addition to the networking that takes place among academic partners and broader dissemination activities aimed at wider academic audiences, projects should also develop links with stakeholders outside the academy in order to maximise the societal benefit of the research. For example collaborations may include the creative, cultural and heritage sectors, broadcasters,

museums, galleries, business, the public sector, voluntary, community and charitable organisations, policy makers and practitioners. Collaborations should be meaningful for all partners involved and enable joint learning throughout the duration of the project and beyond. Public engagement activities may also be included, where appropriate, to promote a wide understanding of the nature and impact of the research.

Annex A – National Eligibility Criteria

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Summary of National Eligibility Criteria Table | [...] |
| Detailed National Eligibility Criteria | |
| • [COUNTRY] | [...] |
| • [COUNTRY] | [...] |
| • [COUNTRY] | [...] |

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

| Country | Who can apply | Available Budget per country | Maximum amount that can be requested, per project | Additional general criteria | National Contact Details |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| [COUNTRY] | [...] | [...] | [...] | [...] | [...] |
| | | | | | |